

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
March 1, 2017**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:02 PM, in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Chairman Guarino, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

**PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**  
**Absent: Garcia**

- Chairman's Statement
- Election of officials
- Announcements
  - Rehabber Club Historic Wood Window Repair Certification Class, March 3 & 4 at Richter House in Hemisfair House
  - STAR in the Mission Historic District - April 1 - 2 and 7 - 8

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:.**

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                               |                                      |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-061 | 312 BURLESON ST                      |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-049 | 721 BURLESON ST                      |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-092 | 201 W COMMERCE ST                    |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-069 | 3100 BROADWAY                        |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-066 | 2450 ROOSEVELT AVE                   |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-074 | 415 FLORIDA ST                       |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-071 | 116 BUFORD                           |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-070 | 121 BUFORD                           |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-072 | 504 KING WILLIAM                     |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-088 | 132 E MAGNOLIA AVE                   |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-082 | 422 HAYS ST                          |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-081 | 431 HAYS ST                          |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-067 | 327/331 RIVERSIDE DR                 |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2017-075 | 307 PEARL PKWY                       |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2016-025 | 2018 AVENUE B                        |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-079 | 637 N MAIN AVE/ Fox Tech High School |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2017-087 | 355 E KINGS HWY                      |
| • Item #18, Case No. 2017-093 | W SUMMIT AND LAKE                    |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2017-077 | 114 E HOUSTON ST                     |
| • Item #20, Case No. 2016-515 | 1829 N NEW BRAUNFELS AVE             |

Items #1 & #2 were pulled by Commissioner Lazerine, Items #7, #8, #11 & #20 were pulled for Citizens to Be Heard.  
Items #16 was pulled for recusals.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve the Consent Agenda with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**1. HDRC NO. 2017-061**

Applicant: Christopher Gill

Address: 312 BURLESON ST

**REQUEST:**

February 15, 2017

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 312 Burleson.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 312 Burleson, in the King William Historic District. The structure was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is found on the 1912 San Born map. The structure features many traditional architectural elements including a front gabled roof, a side gabled roof and a raised front porch.
- b. At the January 6, 2017, HDRC hearing, the applicant received an HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness to reconstruct the front porch, install wood or cement siding foundation skirting and construct a rear addition. The applicant had previously received administrative approval for the removal of a non-original addition, the removal of metal siding, foundation repair, roofing repair and wood element repair including wood siding, trim and windows. This item was originally heard by the HDRC on February 15, 2017; however, the applicant was not present and this case was reset to the March 1, 2017, HDRC hearing.
- c. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 25-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant complete all approved scopes of work in accordance with the issued Certificates of Appropriateness and DSD issued permits.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval with staff stipulations

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**

**NAYS**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**2. HDRC NO. 2017-049**

Applicant: Christopher Gill

Address: 721 BURLESON ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 721 Burleson.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 721 Burleson in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This structure was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is found on the 1912 Sanborn map. The structure feature many traditional architectural elements include a front gabled roof as well as a side gabled roof, a raised front porch and a standing seam metal roof.
- b. At the January 6, 2017, HDRC hearing, the applicant received approval to repair the historic wood windows, install a new standing seam metal roof, repair the wood siding and to repair the foundation. The applicant also received approval to construct a rear addition and install new foundation skirting. This item was originally heard by the HDRC on February 15, 2017; however, the applicant was not present and this case was reset to the March 1, 2017, HDRC hearing.
- c. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 25-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant complete all approved scopes of work in accordance with the issued Certificates of Appropriateness and DSD issued permits.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**

**NAYS**

February 15, 2017

## **THE MOTION CARRIED**

### **7. HDRC NO. 2017-071**

Applicant: Christopher Gill/CGRE LTD CO

Address: 116 BUFORD

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Rehabilitate the historic structure the repair of the existing wood windows and architectural wood elements.
2. Construct a rear addition of approximately 600 square feet.
3. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

#### **FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 116 Buford was constructed circa 1920 and features Folk Victorian elements including a front and side gabled roofs and spindled wall columns. The original front porch columns have been replaced; however, two half columns remain fixed to the front porch walls. The historic structure features two rear addition. Roofing materials include both asphalt shingles and a standing seam metal roof.

b. ORIGINAL MATERIALS - Many of the historic structure's historic materials remain, including wood siding and wood architectural elements. Staff finds that all existing, original elements should be repaired and preserved including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements including wood shingles. Where the original materials do no longer exist, in kind materials are to be installed. The application documents incorrectly represent the historic structure; no original openings, architectural elements or materials are to be removed.

c. PORCH COLUMNS – The structure currently features two wall columns that are original to the structure; however, the two main front porch columns have been removed and replaced with wrought iron columns. The applicant has proposed to install spindled columns that match the profile of those that are currently in existence on the front porch. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

d. FRONT ELEVATION – The structure currently features a modified window opening on the front elevation that features two window openings. The applicant has proposed to maintain this opening and install a wood one over one window. Staff finds that the applicant should install a window that matches a historic width and height.

e. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition of approximately 600 square feet. . The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a rear and side gabled roof and an inset on the east elevation from the wall of the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should install a vertical trim piece on the west façade to separate the rear addition from the primary historic structure.

f. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall roof height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.B., additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the primary historic structure and should feature a height that is less than that of the historic structure. The applicant's proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines in regards to scale, mass and form.

g. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding to match that of the primary historic structure, an asphalt shingle roof, wood or metal windows that match the profile of the historic windows and period appropriate doors. Staff finds the installation of wood windows in the addition as well as wood doors appropriate.

h. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The requirements for Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install a vertical trim piece to separate the primary historic structure from the addition.
- ii. That the applicant provide corrected construction documents to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of

February 15, 2017

Appropriateness that include the correct dimensions, locations and detailing for all proposed scopes of work.  
iii. That the applicant repair and preserve all existing original materials including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Justin Flores with the DHNA, spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**8. HDRC NO. 2017-070**

Applicant: Christopher Gill/ CGRE LTD CO

Address: 121 BUFORD

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Rehabilitate the historic structure including the repair of the existing wood windows and architectural wood elements.
2. Construct a rear addition featuring approximately 500 square feet.
3. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 121 Buford was constructed circa 1930 and features traditional architectural elements including a side gabled roof, a recessed front porch and one rear brick chimney. The structure features small Craftsman elements including roof brackets. The applicant has proposed to rehabilitate the primary historic structure including the repair of the existing wood windows, the repair of wood elements and the repair of the roof. The applicant has noted that all scopes of repair work are to be done with in kind materials.

b. ORIGINAL MATERIALS – Many of the historic structure's historic materials remain, including wood siding and wood architectural elements. Staff finds that all existing, original elements should be repaired and preserved including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements. Where the original materials are no longer existing, in kind materials are to be installed.

c. PORCH COLUMNS – The structure currently features spindled front porch columns and a handrail from previous front porch railings. The applicant has noted that the existing columns are to remain and the handrails are to be removed. Per at 1994 survey photo, neither of these elements are original; the structure originally featured Craftsman style columns with Craftsman style column pedestals.

d. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition of approximately 500 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a rear gabled roof and an inset from the footprint of the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall roof height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.B., additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the primary historic structure and should feature a height that is less than that of the historic structure. The applicant's proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines in regards to scale, mass and form.

f. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding to match that of the primary historic structure, an asphalt shingle roof, wood or metal windows that match the profile of the historic windows and period appropriate doors. Staff finds the installation of wood windows in the addition as well as wood doors appropriate.

g. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The requirements for Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

February 15, 2017

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install wood windows and wood doors throughout the addition. The wood windows should feature a profile that matches those of the primary historic structure.
- ii. That the applicant repair and preserve all existing original materials including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Justin Flores with DHNA, spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino , Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**11. HDRC NO. 2017-082**

Applicant: Brad Kerrick

Address: 422 HAYS ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install a 4' tall metal grid front yard fence with pedestrian and car gate.
2. Increase driveway width with decomposed granite
3. Install decomposed granite area in the rear in place of sod without native plantings

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure is a two-story new construction home a couple of parcels away from the Hays Street Bridge. It is located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, designated in 1983.
- b. The request was heard by the HDRC on February 1, 2017, at which the applicant withdrew in order to come back with construction drawing of the proposed fence.
- c. There is not an existing front yard fence. The proposed front yard fence is a 4' metal grid fence along the front property line and front left property line. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences should appear similar to those used historically throughout the district in terms of scale, transparency and character and should be located only where fences historically existed. With the updated drawing, staff finds the proposed fence consistent with the Guidelines as the horizontal pattern of the wood fence and the grid pattern of the metal fence are characteristic of the materials found on the structure.
- d. The project received final approval for new construction of four single family homes along with a landscaping plan on June 17, 2015. The approval included sod from the driveway to the left property line and native plantings in indicated areas. There is decomposed granite between the grass and the driveway, and there are no native plantings in the indicated areas. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, gravel should not be a replacement for lawn, and if there are areas of decomposed granite, plantings should be incorporated. Staff finds that it would be appropriate if plantings were added to the yard facing the rear alley road, and that lawn would extend up to the driveway as indicated in the plans approved June 17, 2015.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of item #1 through #3 based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

1. That the decomposed granite areas feature native plantings as indicated in the plans approved June 17, 2015.
2. That sod is installed in the area between the grass and the concrete drive as indicated in the plans approved June 17, 2015..

**TABLED UNTIL 3:48 pm**

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Justin Flores, DHNA- spoke in support but with concerns.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval with staff stipulations.

February 15, 2017

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**  
**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2017-079**

Applicant: William Triplett/HEB

Address: 637 N MAIN AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Remove existing exterior stairs and ramps.
2. Clean and repair the brick façade.
3. Replace the existing roof structure.
4. Install canopies at existing building openings.
5. Construct a building connection at the second floor.
6. Reopen previously enclosed window openings.
7. Replace the existing windows.
8. Replace the existing doors.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 637 was constructed circa 1935 and is commonly known as Fox Technical High School, or Fox Tech. The structure features Art Deco architectural detailing and is bound by N Flores and Galitzen. The applicant has proposed a number of exterior modifications that include rehabilitation, repair and maintenance, replacement of windows and the construction and the construct of a second level building connection.

b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 22, 2017, where committee members noted that final landscaping plans should be submitted to the HDRC for review and approval.

c. REMOVAL OF EXTERIOR STAIRS AND RAMPS – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, exterior stairs and ramps located on the rear elevations of the historic structure. Staff finds the existing exterior stairs and ramps to be non-original to the structure and given their location on the rear elevations, will not negatively impact the appearance of the structure from the public right of way when removed. Staff finds the proposed removal of these elements appropriate.

d. FAÇADE RESTORATION – The applicant has proposed to clean and repair the brick façade and cast stone sills and trim. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.A. The brick façade shall be cleaned in a manner that does not damage the surface. The use of strong chemicals, sand blasting and other high pressure cleaning methods are inappropriate.

e. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing roof structure. Per the application documents, the roof profile will remain the same. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.

f. CANOPY INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to install canopies above existing pedestrian entrances. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance 11.B.ii., notes that new canopies and awnings should be added based on accurate evidence of the original. If no such evidence exists, the design of new canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building to which they will be attached. The applicant has proposed steel canopies, many of which are to be located on the rear elevations of the historic structure. Staff finds the proposed profile and location appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed canopies will not obscure any historic architectural elements and can be removed without negative impact to the historic structure.

g. BUILDING CONNECTION – Between buildings C and D, the applicant has proposed to construct a second level pedestrian bridge to facilitate access from one building to another. The applicant has proposed to install the connection structure that features an open air walkway with a canopy cover. The applicant will be creating two new façade openings for the proposed structure. Given its location on two secondary elevations, staff finds this proposal appropriate.

h. ENCLOSED OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed to reopen numerous previously enclosed façade openings. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i.

i. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The structure currently features aluminum windows that feature profiles that

February 15, 2017

include one over one, two over two, fixed panes, casement and other fixed profiles. The applicant has proposed to replace all of the existing windows with new, storefront glazing systems, some of which will feature electronic tinting systems. The applicant has proposed to modify the profiles of many of the existing windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A. and B. note that historic windows should be preserved. When historic windows are beyond repair, new windows are installed, they should match the historic windows in regards to size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail. Additionally, per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vi., replacement glass should be clear. Many of the second level windows are non-original. Staff finds the replacement of these windows as well as the first level windows appropriate. The first level windows are damaged to a degree that warrants an in kind replacement. In regards to the proposed tint, staff finds that given the architecture of the structure, the current window materials and the structure's large southern and western exposures, that the incorporation of tinted windows is appropriate.

j. DOOR REPLACEMENT – The structures currently feature one prominent door that is visible from the public right of way which features wood construction. Per the applicant's construction documents, these doors are to be preserved. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing doors on the rear elevation, many of which are single panel steel doors that feature little to no glazing. Staff finds the proposed replacement of rear doors appropriate.

k. SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed new signage above the existing entrance on N Main to read Cast Tech. Staff finds the location and proportion of the proposed signage appropriate.

l. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted that landscaping plans are still under development. The applicant is to return to the HDRC for approval of landscaping elements..

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #8 based on findings a through i with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant clean the existing façade in a manner that does not cause damage.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Benavides move for approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**

**NAYS:**

**RECUSAL: Guarino**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2017-515**

Applicant: Scott Carpenter/Seventh Generation Design, Inc

Address: 1829 N NEW BRAUNFELS AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Demolish a non-contributing rear addition and non-historic canopy.
2. Repair the existing roof, clean the tiled bulkhead walls, clean the sidewalk tile, repair gutter heads and downspouts and clean the existing blade sign.
3. Install a new aluminum storefront system featuring aluminum storefront transoms.
4. Repair and install new fresnel panels.
5. Reinstall new wood or storefront entry doors.
6. Repair or replace all deteriorated wood sills, jambs, heads and masonry moldings at storefront.
7. Install a new street canopy.
8. Construct a new, rear addition.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 1829 N New Braunfels, commonly known as the Emil Weilbacher Building was constructed in 1921 and is located at the corner of N New Braunfels and E Carson in the Government Hill Historic District. The applicant has proposed a number of rehabilitative items as well as the removal of an existing addition and the construction of an addition. The applicant received conceptual approval on December 21, 2016, with stipulations that included the repair and reinstallation of the fresnel panels on the exterior of the structure and that an additional canopy detail be provided at final approval.

February 15, 2017

b. **ADDITION DEMOLITION** – The rear of the primary historic structure currently features a small addition with an overall height of approximately half of the height of the primary historic structure. This addition features a shed roof and stucco walls. Staff finds its removal appropriate.

c. **CANOPY REMOVAL** – The structure currently features a non-original sidewalk canopy featuring aluminum materials. The applicant has proposed to remove this non-original canopy, but retain all canopy rods and hooks for use later.

d. **REPAIR** – The applicant has proposed a large scope of repair items which includes roof repair, repairs to the existing blade sign, repairs to the existing tile bulkhead walls, repair of existing sidewalk tile and repair to gutter heads and downspouts. The proposed repair items are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A and B.

e. **STOREFRONT SYSTEM** – The existing, wood and aluminum storefront system features many areas of damage and decay. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing storefront system and install a new aluminum storefront system with a 1 3/4" profile width, front glazed with a dark bronzed finish and added extruded aluminum profiled trim with dark bronzed finishes. The existing metal frame profile width is 1 1/4". The applicant has proposed to install new, aluminum frames to replace damaged aluminum. This is consistent with the Guidelines.'

f. **FRESNEL PANELS** – The structure currently features fresnel window panels that are obscured from view by non-original louvers. The applicant has proposed to repair the fresnel panels and install on either the interior or exterior of the structure. Staff finds the repair of the panels appropriate and recommends the panels be installed on the exterior of the structure.

g. **WOOD DOORS** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, wood entry doors. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i. notes that deteriorated doors should be replaced in kind. When in-kind replacement is not feasible, ensure features match the size, material, and profile of the historic element. The applicant has noted that the repair of the existing doors and their retrofitting to become ADA compliant is not feasible. The applicant has proposed to install aluminum doors. Staff finds that the installation of replacement wood doors is appropriate. While the profile of the existing doors may not be matched, wood doors should be installed.

h. **WOOD ELEMENT REPAIR** – The applicant has noted that significant damage has occurred to many wood sills, jambs, heads and masonry moldings throughout the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed to repair all items and replace in kind when necessary. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.i.

i. **CANOPY INSTALLATION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new canopy to match the location and profile of the original canopy. The applicant has proposed to salvage existing original canopy parts and to construct the new canopy based on the profile and design of original canopies of neighboring historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.ii.

j. **REAR ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new addition at the location of the existing addition that is to feature approximately 365 square feet. The applicant has proposed the addition where it will not be visible from the public right of way, will feature a subordinate height and massing and will be distinguishable from the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A. and B

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #8 based on finding a through j with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant install wood replacement doors and that the existing wood doors be incorporated within the project.
- ii. That the fresnel panels be reinstalled on the exterior of the structure.

**Commissioner Cone stepped out of meeting at 3:40 pm and returned at 3:48pm**

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval of this item without staff stipulations and that the existing wood doors, fresnel panels be incorporated in the project, and that profile, color issues & pattern for replacement panels be approved administratively.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**

**NAYS:**



February 15, 2017

## **THE MOTION CARRIED**

### **21. HDRC NO. 2017-533**

Applicant: Carlos Rodriguez/Brightstar Development, LLC

Address: 608 DAWSON ST, 610 DAWSON ST

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting an amendment to a previous Certificate of Appropriateness issued by the Historic and Design Review Commission. The amendments include the following:

1. Install 14 on each house (28 total) aluminum clad one over one windows in lieu of wood windows as stipulated by the HDRC on January 18, 2017.
2. Install 6 on each house (12 total) aluminum clad fixed square windows in lieu of wood windows as stipulated by the HDRC on January 18, 2017.
3. Install 2 on each house (4 total) aluminum clad fixed elongated windows in lieu of wood windows as stipulated by the HDRC on January 18, 2017.
4. Install 1 on each house (2 total) aluminum clad fixed windows with Pella wood inset creating dividing lights in lieu of wood windows with true dividing lights.
5. Install 12 4-over-4 wood screens on the front and right elevation of the front house
6. Install 6 4-over-4 wood screens on the front elevation of the rear house.
7. Install hardiboard siding wood grain out in lieu of smooth side exposed as stipulated by the HDRC on January 18, 2017.

#### **FINDINGS:**

a. The project received final approval from the HDRC on May 4, 2016, to construct two 2-story units on a vacant lot and install fencing. The project received approval to install wood windows in various configurations and install wood siding and wood trim in the two units. During construction, aluminum clad one over one windows and hardiboard siding and trim were installed. The applicant received a stop work order as work was done outside the scope of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The post-work application fee has been paid.

b. On May 4, 2016, staff cited the Guidelines for New Construction, which states windows used in new construction must maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and should be recessed within the window frame. A detail of the wood 4 over 4 windows and fixed windows and wall section was submitted to staff and staff found the details within the proposed elevation consistent with the Guidelines.

c. On January 18, 2017, the applicant received approval to alter the window fenestration, install new windows, and install hardi siding with the stipulations that that the paired windows be separated by a wood trim, that the all windows be made of wood, that the 2 fixed windows include dividing lights, and that the hardiboard siding to be used be installed with the smooth side exposed. The stipulation that the window be separated by a wood trim piece has been satisfied. The applicant is not in agreement to the other stipulations.

d. The request was heard by the Design Review Committee on February 22, 2017. The members present found the proposed wood screen configuration not appropriate. They commented that increasing the number of dividing lights would be more appropriate and that it would increase the character of the two structures. They also had concerns about the false grain hardiboard.

e. ITEM #1, 2, 3 - The proposed windows are putty gray aluminum clad one over one, fixed square or fixed horizontal elongated windows. According to the Guidelines for Windows, windows in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and be recessed within the window frame. Wood windows are most appropriate. Double-hung, block frame windows that feature alternative materials may be considered on a case-by-case basis. They should feature traditional trim and sill details. Paired windows should be separated by a wood mullion. Staff finds the proposed windows are consistent with the Guidelines in terms of profile as they are inset 1 5/6", however staff finds that the paired or trim and the color and texture is not similar to traditional materials. Staff finds that though alternative materials may be appropriate, staff finds that wood is most appropriate and what was approved on May 4, 2016 and January 18, 2017 by the HDRC.

f. ITEM #4 - On May 4, 2016, staff recommended approval and the HDRC approved 2 wood fixed windows with 2x3 dividing lights on the front of each building. The proposed fixed windows are aluminum clad fixed with a wood Pella dividing light insert. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, windows used in new construction must maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and should be recessed within the window frame. Staff finds the wood Pella insert provides the traditional dimension and configuration as a window with true dividing lights. Staff finds the proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

g. SCREENS – Eighteen (18) of the proposed aluminum clad windows that face the street will be covered with wood 4-over-4 screens. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i, use materials that complement

February 15, 2017

the materials and architectural details typically found in the district. Staff finds the wood window screens are consistent with historic structures found in Dignowity Hill Historic District and that the installation of the window screens are consistent with the Guidelines as they will be inset within the window trim.

h. SIDING/TRIM - On May 4, 2016, staff commented that both wood and hardiboard would be appropriate materials according to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i. Wood siding was indicated on the plans submitted by the applicant and approved by the HDRC. The proposed siding is hardiboard siding and hardiboard trim. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i., use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditional found in the district. The applicant said that the product he purchased does not have a smooth side, but two sides reveal the faux grain. Staff finds the proposed hardiboard appropriate for new construction and consistent with the Guidelines as it complements wood in color and texture, but finds the smooth hardi board is most appropriate instead of the faux grain finish.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #7 at this time based on findings a through h. Staff recommends the windows are made of wood and that the hardiboard is installed with the smooth side exposed.

Staff does not recommend wood screens as a solution to conceal the unapproved windows. If the HDRC approves the currently-requested windows based on the circumstances presented, then staff recommends approval of the proposed wood screens as submitted.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

HDRC: Final 5/4/16, Conceptual 3/16/16, revisions 1/18/17

The applicant received a stop work order as work was done outside the scope, and the applicant has provided the required application and the post-work application fee has been paid.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** DHNA, Justin Flores spoke in support but with concerns regarding the applicant's request. Scott Hennke spoke regarding the project.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to move for denial of the applicant's request.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2017-030**

Applicant: Nathan Bailes, The Gerloff Company

Address: 314 DONALDSON AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install wood window screens as a revision to a previously-denied request to replace the windows on the house at 314 Donaldson. The current request includes:

1. Replace 5 original wood one over one windows with 5 new wood one over one windows, in lieu of previous approval to repair (previously-denied);
2. Replace 15 original wood windows, damaged beyond repair with 15 new vinyl one over one windows, in lieu of previous approval to replace with in-kind wood windows (previously-denied);
3. Install wood screens over windows on the left and right elevations

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure is a one-story home with Spanish eclectic influences with stucco siding. It is a contributing structure located in the Monticello Park Historic District, designated in 1995.

b. A proposal was heard by the HDRC on April 20, 2016, for approval to replace 20 existing wood windows with 20 new wood windows. The HDRC action approved repair of the front five windows, labeled #1 through #5, and replacement in-kind for the remaining 15 windows based on the findings of fact. This proposal was never executed and the applicant ultimately replaced five windows and installed 15 vinyl windows without a Certificate of Appropriateness. As a revision to the previous request, the applicant has proposed to install wood screens to

February 15, 2017

conceal the vinyl windows

c. The HDRC previously denied request items #1 and 2 on February 1, 2017. That request included to remove 5 original wood one over one windows and replace with 5 new wood windows, and remove 15 original wood one over one windows and replace with 15 new vinyl one over one windows.

d. The applicant is requesting to According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii. and the *Guidelines for Windows*, historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond 50% deteriorated, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. Staff had made a site visit on April 12, 2016, and found that the front windows (#1 to 5) are in poor condition, but repairable and covered in metal screens. Staff recommended that windows #1 through #5 be repaired and approval of replacing #6 through #20 with the stipulations that specifications on the wood windows to be installed be provided to staff prior to receiving the Certificate of Appropriateness; that the new windows maintain the original dimension and profile, feature clear glass, and maintain the original appearance of window trim and sill. (These specifications were provided to staff on April 29, 2016, and the CoA was issued the applicant.) Staff finds that if the front five windows were truly beyond repair, that the applicant should have returned with a new application for approval to replace.

e. Staff finds the proposed vinyl one over one windows not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the original wood one over one windows be replaced in-kind, maintain the original dimension and profile, feature clear glass, and maintain the original appearance of window trim and sill.

f. The proposed window screens will cover vinyl windows on the left and right elevations. They are to be installed inset within the stucco frame, and installed each with two hinges. Previously there were non-original aluminum screens in place. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., replace non-historic elements with those that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that window screens are found on Spanish eclectic style homes in front of wood windows of different configurations, and that their installation is generally appropriate provided that all other guidelines for windows are met.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Items #1 & #2: Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed replacement windows. Staff recommends that the applicant confirm with the April 20, 2016, Certificate of Appropriateness to repair the 5 front windows and replace the remainder with in-kind wood windows.

Item #3: Staff does not recommend wood screens as a solution to conceal inappropriate replacement windows. If the HDRC approves request items 1 and 2 based on the circumstances presented, then staff recommends approval of the proposed wood screens as submitted.

#### **CASE COMMENTS**

- HDRC 4/20/16
- HDRC 2/1/17
- The applicant received a stop work order as work was done outside the scope. The applicant has provided the required application and the post-work application fee has been paid

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move for approval of item #1 and denial of items #2 & #3.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

**NAYS:**

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

### **23. HDRC NO. 2017-076**

Applicant: Willie A, JR & Guadalupe I Francois

Address: 817 NOLAN / 705 N PINE

February 15, 2017

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a rear accessory structure to serve as a garage for three vehicles with an attached storage structure.
2. Construct a rear, open air covered patio.
3. Install various concrete walkways on site.
4. Install a concrete driveway to be accessed by an existing curb cut.
5. Install various landscaping elements on site both lots.
6. Install fencing to enclose both lots.
7. Construct a roof over the existing wrap around porch.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 817 Nolan first appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps and originally featured a double height front porch and Craftsman elements including roof brackets and large, square Craftsman style columns. The structure is in the process of being substantially rehabilitated. The lot at the corner of Nolan and N Pine Streets is addressed as 705 N Pine and is currently void of any structures.

b. **REAR GARAGE & STORAGE STRUCTURE** – At the rear of the lot at 817 Nolan, to the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a garage to accommodate three vehicles as well as an attached storage shed. The applicant has proposed an overall footprint of approximately 1,100 square feet. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. states that garages and outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure on the site, should be no larger in plan than 40 percent of the primary historic structure, should relate architecturally to the primary historic structure and should feature windows, doors and garage doors that feature proportions and materials similar to those found historically in the district. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines through the use of complementary materials and architectural detailing. The applicant has proposed to install wood garage doors.

c. **OPEN AIR PATIO** – To the west of the proposed rear garage and storage structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an open air patio and garage structure. The proposed open air patio structure is to feature a footprint of approximately 200 square feet, an overall height of approximately fifteen (15) feet and architectural details that are to match those of the primary historic structure. The applicant has noted the installation of support columns, which staff finds appropriate; however, the proposed columns should be square to complement those of the primary historic structure.

d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – For both proposed accessory structure, the applicant has proposed a location, at the rear of the property and setbacks that are both appropriate.

e. **SIDEWALKS**– Throughout the site, the applicant has proposed to install concrete sidewalks to connect the various proposed structures. In the front yard of 817 Nolan, the applicant has proposed to install a sidewalk leading from the primary historic structure to the sidewalk at the public right of way. There are currently existing concrete steps, but no sidewalk leading to the front porch. The applicant has proposed to replace these existing steps with new steps. Staff finds the installation of the concrete sidewalks on site as well as the replacement of the existing concrete steps appropriate; however, the proposed concrete steps are to match the profile of the existing and the front sidewalk is to be the width of those found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

f. **DRIVEWAY** – The applicant has proposed to install a new driveway to be accessed by an existing curb cut and approach to facilitate vehicular access to the proposed accessory structure. The applicant has proposed a driveway width of fourteen (14) feet. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., which states that driveways should be no wider than ten (10) feet in width within historic district.

g. **LANDSCAPING ELEMENTS** – The applicant has received approval from the City Arborist to remove three pecan trees located within the front yard of 817 Nolan. The applicant has proposed to mitigate the removal of these trees per the City Arborist's recommendation as well as plant various Crape Myrtles along the public right of way at N Pine and various other low growing plants along the north property line and around the foundation skirting of the primary historic structure. Staff finds this installation appropriate.

h. **PORCH ROOF** – The applicant received approval on December 3, 2014, for the construction of a porch to the east façade of the primary historic structure. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct a roof to cover portions of the historic porch, which were never covered, as well as to construct roof over the recently completed side porch. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 7.B.iv., new elements and details that create a false sense of history should not be added to historic structure. Staff finds that the installation of a single story porch roof would both create a false sense of history and be architecturally inappropriate for a historic Craftsman structure.

February 15, 2017

i. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to enclose both lots, 817 Nolan and 705 N Pine with fencing. The applicant has proposed to install a six foot tall wood privacy fence to extent along the western property line to stop at the front façade of the property, a five foot tall iron fence along the public right of way at Nolan, a five foot tall iron gate and five foot tall rolling iron gate for the proposed sidewalk and driveway. At the lot line, the applicant has proposed to install a five foot tall wood post and wire fence and wood gate to extend along both Nolan and N Pine.

j. FENCING – The Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B. states that fencing should appear similar to those found historically throughout the district in regards to transparency, scale and character, should be located where historically a fence would have existed and should not exceed four feet in height. Staff finds the proposed height and locations of the proposed fencing inappropriate. Historic fences throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District do not feature recessed gates.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install square columns on the proposed open air porch to complement those of the primary historic structure.
- ii. That the proposed front sidewalk and replacement steps feature a width consistent with sidewalks and steps found historically in Dignowity Hill.
- iii. That the applicant install fencing that does not exceed four feet in height except for the proposed privacy fencing.
- iv. That all gates be flush with perimeter fences.
- v. That the applicant submit fencing details to staff noting a height of four (4) feet and overall design

**CASE COMMENT:**

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move for approval of items #1- #6 with staff stipulations except for as it pertains to the height of the fence, the commission approves a 5ft fence as it was presented at the hearing by the applicant, with the plan for the fence to inset at the front walk but not to inset at the driveway - denial of item #7.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2017-054**

Applicant: Joseph Milligan

Address: 921 LAMAR ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

- 1. Construct a rear covered porch with a gable roof
- 2. Re-roof existing standing seam metal roof with new standing seam metal roof
- 3. Install skirting
- 4. Replace door and transom light

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure is a one story folk Victorian structure. It is a contributing structure located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, designated in 1983.

b. RE-ROOF – The existing roof material is standing seam metal. The proposed new roof would match in-kind, matching the panel width, seam height, and installation method. Staff finds this is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

c. ROOF FORM – The rear roof has a hipped roof form. The proposed addition has a rear gable that appears to meet the existing rear hip below the ridge height. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., use a similar roof form and orientation as the structure, particularly if visible from the street. Staff finds the proposed gable is not consistent with the existing rear roof form. Staff finds a hipped roof is more appropriate.

February 15, 2017

d. **TRANSITION** – The proposed covered porch will have a rear gable roof, whose ridge starts below the ridge of the existing rear hip. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., there should be a small change at the seam in order to provide a visual distinction between old and new. Staff finds the proposed roof distinguished the addition from the main structure, thus is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. **SCALE & MASS** – The proposed covered porch is approximately 240 square feet of covered, open space to the rear of the main structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 2A. and .B.ii., new additions should be subordinate to the principle façade and not double the existing square footage. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines in terms of scale and mass as it's lower in height and less than half the area of the main structure.

f. **MATERIALS** – The addition will have a standing seam metal roof to match the existing standing seam metal roof. The rear gable will have wood lap siding, columns and a porch decking. Staff has asked the applicant for details of the materials to be used, but has not received them at the time of posting. According to the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., materials that match in type, color and texture and include an offset to distinguish from the historic structure should be used. Staff is not able to make a determination at this time. Staff recommends that the columns and porch decking should be wood to be consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant is proposing a closed gable roof addition with a one over one window. The gable will be supported by 3 round columns. Staff has asked details about other modifications occurring along the rear façade, as it appears the windows in the elevation drawings are of different sizes, and the rear door location has changed. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii., details should not overwhelm the original structure and be compatible with the style of the home. Staff finds the gable roof and gable window proportion consistent with folk Victorian homes, however recommends the applicant submit a more detailed existing and proposed site plan, that the windows not be modified, and that the window to be installed in the gable be made of wood, one over one to match the existing window material and configuration.

h. **SKIRTING** – There is no existing skirting. It appears new skirting will be installed on the existing structure and on the rear porch addition; however the skirting material has not been indicated by the applicant. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.i, replacement skirting should consist of durable proven materials, and should be applied consistent with the style of the home.

i. **DOOR** – The proposed door has a half window light and a transom light. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, non-historic elements should be replaced with those that would have historically been installed with the style of the home. Staff finds the proposed door appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines as a transom and half window light are typical for Folk Victorian homes.

j. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – At this time, the applicant has not applied for Historic Tax Certification. Staff recommends the applicant apply for the historic tax incentive which lasts a total of ten (10) years.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

1. That the rear roof form be hipped
2. Skirting material consistent with the style of the home
3. If the rear gable is approved, the window to be installed in the gable should be made of wood, one over one to match the existing window material and configuration.
4. That the applicant submit the Historic Tax Certification application and required supplemental documentation

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for approval with the drawings as submitted today, with stipulations that the window meet staff recommendations and that the roof feature a crimped ridge seam.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2017-078**

Applicant: Susan Todd

February 15, 2017

Address: 923 E CROCKETT ST, 927 E CROCKETT ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install crushed granite parking in the rear yard of each home
2. Install 4' hog-wire front yard fence along left and right side property lines and enclosing the side yard
3. Install walking paths in front yard made of flagstones

**FINDINGS:**

a. The homes at 923 E Crockett and 927 E Crockett are located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, which was designated in 1983. Both homes are folk Victorian in style. 923 E Crockett was built circa 1895 and 927 E Crockett was built circa 1910.

b. REAR – The existing rear yard at both addresses includes sod, than can be accessed by a single shared ribbon driveway between the two properties. The proposed crush granite parking lot would cover the rear yard of both addresses. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.ii., new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible from the right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal to include decomposed granite in the rear consistent with the Guidelines as it will not adversely affect the historic structure.

c. FENCE – There is not existing front yard fence. The proposed fence is a hog-wire fence made of a wood frame and hog-wire mesh and will be in the side yard, and in the front yard only along the left and right property lines extending to the street. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B., new fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of scale, transparency, and character. Height should be limited to 4'. According to A Guide to San Antonio's Historic Resources, within Dignowity Hill Historic District many front yards are enclosed with historic wrought iron fences, or with stone or brick walls. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines in terms of transparency, location and appropriate for the historic district, but finds the configuration of the fence inappropriate. Staff finds a front yard fence that appears to enclose the yard appropriate.

d. FRONT WALKWAY – Existing in the front of both addresses is a 4' wide straight concrete walkway connecting the sidewalk to the front porch steps. The applicant has requested to replace the existing concrete walkways and installing flagstones in place of the walkway. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.ii, if a sidewalk is deteriorated beyond repair, it should be replaced to match existing sidewalk color, material, width, and configuration. Staff finds the request is not consistent with the Guidelines. Repair and replacement of the concrete walkway in the original alignment, width and configuration would be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of item #1 and #2 based on findings a through c with the following stipulation:

1. That the front yard fence extends along the front property line as indicated in finding d. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3 based on the finding d. Staff recommends that the concrete walkways be replaced in-kind or to match the original alignment, width and configuration.

**APPLICANT WITH DREW ITEM #3**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for approval of items #1 & #2.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2017-085**

Applicant: Bob King/Alamo Construction

Address: 325 W MISTLETOE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Remove a chimney and flue vent.

February 15, 2017

2. Remove and replace an original 6 over 1 window on the primary façade with a new 1 over 1 window.
3. Reuse the original 6 over 1 window in a previously-approved addition to the rear of the property.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The existing structure is designed in the Craftsman Bungalow style and is estimated to be constructed between 1930 and 1935. The property appears on a Sanborn map in 1935. The chimney, constructed of brick masonry, is located on center with the primary front-facing façade of the home and is a character defining feature. The flue vent is located in the rear of the structure and cannot be seen from the public right-of-way.
- b. The applicant notes that the fireplace and chimney have been decommissioned for some time. The intent of the interior remodel is to remove the fireplace completely.
- c. A letter dated January 27, 2017 from a certified professional engineer notes cracking and mortar deterioration in the chimney, along with faulty original construction of the flue vent. The engineer recommended that both be torn down and replaced due to these concerns.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic masonry should be preserved or replaced with in-kind material whenever possible. The proposed removal of the original chimney is not consistent with the Guidelines and is not appropriate.
- e. The original 6 over 1 window, located directly to the right of the property's main entrance, had also been removed and replaced without approval. The applicant noted in a call on February 20 that the original window had been reused in the addition to the rear of the property. Administrative approval was granted to repair the original window on August 12, 2016, so the current conditions are in violation with the approvals on record.
- f. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved unless deteriorated beyond repair. The window was previously deemed repairable when approved for Historic Tax Credit Certification on December 7, 2016. The proposed removal and reuse of the 6 over 1 window is not appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval for request 1 based on findings a, c, and d.

Staff does not recommend approval for requests 2 and 3 based on findings e and f.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

- Staff conducted a site visit on February 18, 2017, and noted that the chimney had already been removed without prior approval in the form of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The post work application fee has not yet been processed.
- The applicant requested Historic Tax Certification (case no. 2016-483) and was heard by the HDRC on December 7, 2017. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 were met and the application was approved as submitted. Approval of Historic Tax Verification is contingent on consistency with all approvals and permits. Currently, the property is in violation and is not eligible to receive the incentive.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move this item to the next agenda

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**27. HDRC NO. 2017-080**

Applicant: Arthur Gonzalez

Address: 507 KINGS COURT

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two-story 20' by 20' rear accessory structure.



February 15, 2017

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The main structure is a craftsman style home built circa 1926. It is a contributing structure within the Monte Vista Historic District that was designated in 1975. There are two existing rear structures. One is noted as contributing in the 1995 Monte Vista survey.
- b. The proposed structure was built in 2012 without a Certificate of Appropriateness or City permits.
- c. SETBACKS/ORIENTATION – The proposed two-story accessory structure will be set to the rear left of the property, to the left of the existing accessory structures. The new construction is 3' from the left property line and 5' from the rear property line, and faces the interior of the lot. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B., new rear buildings should follow the historic setback pattern of similar structures along the block and should match the predominate orientation. Staff finds the proposed setbacks and orientation are consistent with the Guidelines in terms of building placement. Setbacks and proximity to other out buildings must be reviewed and approved by DSD as part of the permitting process.
- d. CHARACTER – The main structure is a craftsman style house of modest size featuring asbestos siding, a front gabled roof with composition shingles, and a front chimney. The proposed rear accessory structure has a front gable roof, vertical plywood panel, a composition shingle roof, is two-stories, and 400 square feet. The building lacks architectural ornamentation and compatible design elements such as trim, eave, and siding details. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., new outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the principal building. The overall design and selected materials are not compatible with the character of the primary structure on the property and are not appropriate.
- e. MASSING/FORM – The proposed accessory structure is a two-story set to the rear of the main structure. It has an uninterrupted wall plane that is 13' tall and a 20' x 20' footprint. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40% of the principal historic structure's foot print, and should be visibly subordinate to historic structures. Staff made a site visit February 24, 2017, and found that the proposed garage would be minimally seen from the public right-of-way as it is set to the rear of the main structure. However, the outbuilding is taller than other structures on the property, and uninterrupted mass of the wall planes contribute to the visual dominance of the structure.
- f. WINDOWS/DOORS – The proposed accessory structure has seven vinyl windows with false dividing lights. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v., doors and windows should be similar in proportion and materials as those traditional found in the district. Staff finds the proposed windows are not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds wood one over one windows would be appropriate. Additional fenestrations on blank walls would also be more appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends does not recommend approval based on findings a through f. Staff recommends that the overall design be modified to include architectural features, materials, and fenestrations that are compatible within the historic district.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

The proposed structure was built in 2012. The post-work application fee has been paid.

PERMITS: The applicant has submitted a permit application with Development Services after the structure was built. The permit is open, and has not been closed yet as the applicant needs to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness prior to permits being pulled. If a COA is approved, the building must complete all required inspections and fees associated with the permitting process.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to move for denial of the applicant's request with staff recommendations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Connor, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**COMMISSION ACTION:** The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve February 15, 2017 HDRC meeting minutes.

February 15, 2017

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Connor, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza  
**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to Adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Garza to adjourn.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza  
**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:07 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair